

04 February 2009



Ms. Nicole Steele, Project Manager
Loudoun County Department of Planning
1 Harrison Street, SE
3rd Floor
PO Box 7000
Leesburg, VA 20177-7000

RE: Moorefield Station, SPEX 2006-0026

Dear Ms. Steele



We are in receipt of the referral comments for the second submission of Moorefield Station Retail- Drive Thru Bank- SPEX 2006-0026.

VIRGINIA OFFICES:

Chantilly
Bridgewater
Leesburg
Virginia Beach
Woodbridge

LABORATORY:

Chantilly

MARYLAND OFFICES:

Columbia
Frederick
Germanstown
Hollywood

WEST VIRGINIA
OFFICE:

Martinsburg

As you are aware, these returned referral comments date from January of 2007. This application had originally been waiting on the approval of FIDP 2004-0002 to set the proportion of land use mixes in accordance with the Land Use Mix Chart as shown on Sheet 2 of original Moorefield Station Zoning Application.

Subsequent to our last discussions, the owners of the property (all owners of the original Moorefield Zoning) have been involved with the a Zoning Concept Plan Amendment (ZCPA 2007-0004) and Zoning Modification (ZMOD 2007-0005) for the entirety of Moorefield Station. These plans revise the Land Use Mix Chart in the TDSA to allow 325,000 square feet of retail / commercial in the first phase of development and therefore allowing the commercial use of the banks to be permitted (see note 13 on sheet 2 included in this application). The drive through portion of the bank still needs this SE to be approved.

The Board of Supervisors Public Hearing for these applications is set for February 9th. We expect the applications will be approved at a Board of Supervisors Business Meeting soon after the Public Hearing.

The following are responses to the most recent returned referrals.

T 800.553.PHRA

T 703.777.3616

F 703.777.3725

208 Church St., S.E.
Leesburg, VA
20175

Zoning Administration Referral:

From Adrienne Kotula, Planner, Zoning Administration dated April 10, 2007

A. CRITICAL ISSUES

- *Section 4-1109(C) – The uses proposed with this application are currently not permitted. No commercial retail and service uses are permitted within Moorefield Station until a Final Development Plan has been approved which demonstrates that the minimum mix of uses (outlined on Sheet 2 the Concept Development Plan) has been achieved within the Transit-Designed Supportive Area.*

Response: The approval of Moorefield Station ZCPA 2007-0004 and ZMOD 2007-0005 revise the TDSA Land Use Chart (note 13 on Sheet 2) to allow 325,000 Square Feet of Retail in the Car Phase of the Moorefield Station development. This eliminates the need for this SE to be tied to approval of any FIDP. It is understood that this SE will not be able to be approved until said ZCPA and ZMOD are approved by the Board of Supervisors.

- *Sections 4-1106, 4-1107, 4-1116 & 4-1120 – The zoning tabulation provided does not outline all of the requirements of these Sections. List all of the requirements. It is not necessary, at this time, to detail how these requirements will be met although the applicant is advised that it should be confirmed that the requirements can be satisfied by this site.*

Response: The plan has been updated to show the requirements of Sections 4-1106, 4-1107, 4-1116 & 4-1120. It is understood the requirements of these sections will be met at the time of Site Plan.

- *Section 4-1111(A)(2) – Staff continues to note that there is no pedestrian connection from the sidewalk along Mooreview Parkway to the proposed bank buildings. Direct pedestrian access to the buildings is required by this Section. Also be advised that Section 4-1111(A)(3) requires that the most direct pedestrian route be provided.*

Response: A pedestrian connection is has been made from the Mooreview Parkway trail directly to the sidewalk system in the retail center. Both of these proposed drive through uses are served by this connection. This is highlighted on Sheet 2 of this application.

Community Planning Referral:

From Pat Giglio, Planner dated January 16, 2007

- *Staff supports the applicants request for a Special Exception (SPEX) for the two proposed banks with drive-through facilities on the subject site and recommends approval of the application.*

Virginia Department of Transportation Referral:

From Rashid Siraj, P.E., Transportation Engineer dated January 19, 2007

- *We have reviewed the above application as requested and have no objection to the approval.*

Office of Transportation Services Referral:

From Mark Matthews, Transportation Operation Engineer, dated January 16, 2007

Outstanding items highlighted below:

3. *When will the drive-in banks be opened in relation to the phasing of other businesses and improvements?*

A68

PHR+A

Response: The center will be developed generally in one phase. Currently it is proposed as one phase with the approved site plan. The center cannot open without improvements of Mooreview Parkway and Old Ryan Road.

Issue Status: Not resolved. The Applicant should clarify whether Mooreview Parkway is being built to the interim or ultimate condition as specified in the Countywide Transportation Plan. If it is built to the interim condition, Mooreview Parkway should be built to accommodate the ultimate condition (in accordance with the Countywide Transportation Plan, Appendix 1: A1-32) of a U6M road plus bicycle/pedestrian facilities on both sides of the road. The applicant needs to depict the ultimate condition of the road with lane directional arrows and bicycle/pedestrian facilities and show how the proposed improvements would work within the ultimate condition both on the plan view and in a cross section. The plan view and cross section should depict a ten foot wide multi-purpose trail centered over a fourteen public access easement if not in the ROW or bicycle lanes on both sides of the road. Additional ROW may be required for turn lanes required at all intersections, per the Countywide Transportation Plan.

If the bicycle/pedestrian facilities are not proffered, please label "proposed locations" and "to be built by others." Staff recommends the applicant review construction plans submitted to the County for Mooreview Parkway (East Spine Road) to ensure coordination with the bicycle/pedestrian facilities and to address any transitions between bicycle/pedestrian facility types. Please depict in cross section final design ROW line and centerline.

Response: The initial Mooreview Parkway improvements have been completed. CPAP 2005-0047 is approved and the section from Loudoun County Parkway to the Ryan Road intersection has been completed and is open for traffic. The CPAP approval also includes the Ryan Road frontage for this subject site. In addition, the approval includes the 6' Bicycle in the roadway as well as the 10' Regional North-South Trail.

There are Bus stops and Bicycle storage lockers proposed on both sides of Ryan Road directly northwest of subject Bank facilities.

The Grading Plan for the retail center has been approved and infrastructure improvements have started. This allows the infrastructure for the entire center to be installed as well as the construction of the multi-family apartment buildings.



A69

A site plan revision (STPR 2009_000x) has been submitted to include the buildings in the retail development. It is anticipated that this plan be approved shortly after the ZCPA and ZMOD Board of Supervisors approval.

4. *Depending on phasing and/or peak hour impact, does the applicant propose any additional infrastructure in the vicinity of this site?*

Previous Response: None are anticipated, as the adjacent roadway improvements, signalization, and turn lanes included in the technical analyses are proffered by Moorefield Station, and are under construction as part of adjacent development.

Issue Status: Not resolved. The illustrated lane configuration on Mooreview Parkway (East Spine Road) needs significant improvement, including the question of dual right turn-lanes and compatibility with ultimate condition of East Spine Road in the Countywide Transportation Plan.

The Applicant should also label Mooreview Parkway as "also known as Route 772 Relocated (Ashburn Village Boulevard/East Spine Road)", in order to clarify its nomenclature in the CTP.

Response: The Mooreview Parkway improvements shown on this plan reflect the approved CPAP 2005-0047 and the road as constructed.

5. *What bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities are associated with this location?*

Original Response: There are bicycle lockers included within this center. They are located on the north and south sides of Ryan Road. Please see Sheet 3 of this application which has a new exhibit titled- Local Neighborhood Pedestrian Network. There are pedestrian walkways, crosswalks and a plaza all proposed as a part of the retail center. This exhibit

Issue Status: Not resolved. Please see Comment # 3

Response: There are bicycle lockers included within this center. They are located on the north and south sides of Ryan Road. Please see Sheet 3 of this application which has a new exhibit titled- Local Neighborhood Pedestrian Network. There are pedestrian walkways, crosswalks and a plaza all proposed as a part of the retail center.

The initial Mooreview Parkway improvements have been completed. CPAP 2005-0047 is approved and the section from Loudoun County Parkway to the Ryan Road



intersection has been completed and is open for traffic. The CPAP approval also includes the Ryan Road frontage for this subject site. In addition, the approval includes the Bicycle lane in Mooreview Parkway.

The approved Site Plan includes the 10' north-south regional trail system along Mooreview Parkway.

These facilities are highlighted on Sheet 2 of this application.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarification with any of these responses. Thank you again for your assistance with this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

P_HR+A

Patton Harris Rust & Associates

A Professional Corporation



Mark Thomas, CLA
Director of Planning and Landscape Architecture

A-71

This page intentionally left blank.

December 14, 2006

Ms. Nicole Steele, Project Manager
Loudoun County Department of Planning
1 Harrison Street, SE
3rd Floor
PO Box 7000
Leesburg, VA 20177-7000

RE: Moorefield Station, SPEX 2006-0026

Dear Ms. Steele

We are in receipt of the referral comments for the initial submission of Moorefield Station Retail-Drive Thru Bank- SPEX 2006-0026. We appreciate the meeting in which these items were discussed on Tuesday December 5. We offer the following in response to the returned referrals and the discussion in our meeting.



CORPORATE:
Chantilly

VIRGINIA OFFICES:
Chantilly
Bridgewater
Fredericksburg
Leesburg
Richmond
Virginia Beach
Winchester
Woodbridge

LABORATORIES:
Chantilly
Fredericksburg

MARYLAND OFFICES:
Baltimore
Columbia
Frederick
Germantown
Hollywood
Hunt Valley

WEST VIRGINIA
OFFICE:
Martinsburg

T 800.553.PHRA
T 703.777.3616
F 703.777.3725
208 Church St., S.E.
Leesburg, VA
20175

Zoning Administration Referral:

From Adrienne Kotula, Planner, Zoning Administration dated November 16, 2006

A. CRITICAL ISSUES

- **Section 4-1109(C)** – *The use mix table for the TDSA (located on Sheet 2 of the Concept Development Plan for ZMAP-2001-0003) lists the proportion of commercial retail and services as zero. Accordingly, the minimum proportion of all other uses listed must be met (“as evidenced by an approved Final Development Plan”) prior to any commercial retail and services being approved. Therefore, FIDP-2005-0001 (in combination with the previously approved FIDP-2004-0002) must demonstrate that all other use percentage minimums are met and be approved prior to the approval of this Special Exception.*

Response: It is understood by the applicant that FIDP 2004-0002 must be approved prior to the approval of this application.

- **Section 5-659** – *There are inconsistencies within the Special Exception Plat and Statement of Justification regarding the number of service lanes each bank is to contain. In some instances, four service lanes are proposed and in others, only three are proposed. This Section limits the number of service lanes to three, with one escape lane being permitted. A modification, by Special Exception, of this requirement may be approved by the Board of Supervisors upon finding that such modification to the regulations will achieve an innovative design, improve upon the existing regulations, preserve the County’s historic or archeological heritage, or otherwise exceed the public purpose of the existing regulation. If the modification is desired, provide a separate statement of justification for this modification which addresses the above mentioned Section 5-600 requirements as well as the requirements of Section 6-1300.*

Response: The plan has been revised to include three (3) drive-through lanes and an escape lane for each bank.

B. OTHER ISSUES

A-73

- **Sections 4-1106, 4-1116 & 4-1120** – A zoning tabulation should be provided which outlines the lot requirements as well as the required landscaped open space and tree canopy. It is not necessary, at this time, to detail how these requirements will be met although the applicant is advised that it should be confirmed that the requirements can be satisfied by this site.

Response: The tabulation has been provided.

- **Section 4-1111(A)(2)** – Staff notes that there is no pedestrian connection from the sidewalk along Mooreview Parkway to the proposed bank buildings. Direct pedestrian access to the buildings is required by this Section. Also be advised that Section 4-1111(A)(3) requires that the most direct pedestrian route be provided.

Response: Direct pedestrian access has been provided between the Sidewalk/Trail and bank.

- **Sections 4-1118(A) & 6-1310(F)** – The landscaping provided between the parking lot and Mooreview Parkway does not completely screen the parking lot. In particular, the northeastern corner lacks landscaping and the shrubbery provided is insufficient.

Response: The landscaping includes the appropriate amount of screen and buffer from Mooreview Parkway.

- **Section 4-1118(B)** – The buffer type provided between the bank site and the future day care site should be stated. The buffer currently shown on the Special Exception Plat does not match any buffer within the Ordinance. Be advised that parking lot landscaping requirements must also be met.

Response: This is to be a Type II Side Yard buffer. In addition, there is a required 50' buffer that will be necessary on the Day Care site per ZCPA 1990-0005.

- **Section 5-659(B)** – Demonstrate that adequate stacking spaces will be provided to avoid vehicle stacking within drive lanes, parking areas and streets. Staff notes that Bank Pad #2, as currently proposed, lacks an escape lane which would allow for the flow of traffic.

Response: The appropriate stacking spaces have been shown on the plat. In addition there is now an escape lane provided with Bank 2.

- **Section 5-1100** – Update/Remove the parking tabulation on Sheet 1. The parking rate for this portion of Moorefield Station is to be done at the Larger Integrated Shopping Center tabulation per FIDP-2004-0002. If the tabulation is removed, add a note stating that parking will be provided in accordance with FIDP-2004-0002, Section 5-1100, as well as Section 4-1117.

Response: The tabulation has been removed. The parking requirements will be included with the Larger Integrated Shopping Center site plan (See Note 9)

- The title block on Sheet 1 should be revised to state that the bank with drive-through use permitted by Section 4-1105(C)(5) is subject to Section 5-659.



A74

Response: The title block has been amended as requested.

- Update Note 1 on Sheet 1 to state that the site is subject to the proffers approved with ZMAP-2001-0003.

Response: Note 1 on Sheet 1 has been amended as requested.

- Add a note which states that all development on this site is subject to FIDP-2004-0002.

Response: Note 11 has been included to state that all development on this site is subject to FIDP-2004-0002.

- Remove/Revise Note 13 on Sheet 1. Several additional approvals are required after the approval of this Special Exception, not simply zoning permits. If the note is to remain, include all of these approvals. Alternately, remove the note.

Response: This note has been removed as requested.

- Revise Note 16 on Sheet 1 to state that signage will comply with the requirements of Section 5-1100, the modifications approved with ZMAP-2001-0003 and any additional modification which may be approved in the future. Additionally, the note should be revised to remove reference to the fact that signage locations shall be determined at site plan review as site plan review does not include the review of signage.

Response: This information has been updated as note 17.

- The legend on Sheet 2 is called the "Existing Conditions Legend" yet existing conditions are not shown on this Sheet.

Response: This legend has been updated.

- Staff recommends the removal of reference to sign locations within the legend on the Special Exception Plat as this is determined at a later date within the County review process.

Response: The reference to the sign locations has been removed.

- The legend on Sheet 2 of the Special Exception Plat states that the maximum height of buildings is 40 feet while the plan itself shows the maximum height as 35 feet. Correct the discrepancy.

Response: The buildings and the legend now both reference 35' maximum height.

- Remove the first note at the top of Sheet 2. It is unnecessary to state that the applicant reserves the right to construct by-right uses, as the approval of this Special Exception does not preclude that from happening. Additionally, portions of the notes are redundant.

Response: This note has been revised as requested

- Provide information which demonstrates that the front elevations of the banks shall be consistent with local and regional architecture as required by the proffered design guidelines. The elevations submitted do



not demonstrate this.

Response: The elevations have been resubmitted. A letter from the Claude Moore Charitable Foundation has been included stating that these elevations meet the intent of the proffered design guidelines. The applicant will agree to a condition of substantial conformance to these submitted elevations on all four (4) sides.

Community Planning Referral:

From Pat Giglio, Planner dated November 1, 2006

A. LAND USE

- *Overall, staff finds that the use of the subject site for the two proposed banks with drive-through facilities complies with the policies of the Revised General Plan and the Retail Plan, although it should be noted that the policies do not provide specific guidance regarding drive-through facilities. The proposal is problematic given that the market it will serve in Moorefield Station is not yet built.*



Response/Clarifications:

- This application is a part of the larger CTD Moorefield Retail site plan. This shopping center is designed to be a neighborhood center supported by the 1000 residential units in the OTDSA sector of Moorefield Station. The banks will support these neighborhoods as well as serve the business /retail/residential uses within the walkable distance of the ITDSA currently in FDP review.

Building Placement and Design Outstanding Issues

- *Staff recommends that the applicant commit to building placement and design. Staff further recommends the building placement be located near the internal street to encourage pedestrian access. Such placement is consistent with the Moorefield Station Design Guidelines for Buildings within the Transit Supportive Area. Staff also recommends the applicant commit to four-sided architecture that will incorporate recesses, off-sets, angular forms, or other features to avoid presenting a "blank side" to adjoining properties. The applicant should also design the sign package to blend with the architecture of the buildings and to be unobtrusive. Staff notes that the site will have to meet the design guidelines as proffered for the Moorefield Station rezoning application (ZMAP 2001-0003) and will therefore be required to have a unified design theme with the rest of the development*

Response:

- The site plans have been submitted for this shopping center and the applicant is committed to these designs.
- The pedestrian connections have been clarified between the banks and the remainder of the neighborhood center.
- The applicant will commit to four (4) sided architecture as proposed with this application, as well as the footprints.
- The applicant will design the signs sign package to blend with the architecture of the buildings and to be unobtrusive. This will be part of a separate approval process.
- It is required that this site be designed to meet the proffered Moorefield Station Design Guidelines. A letter stating conformance

A.76

with these guidelines will be submitted under separate cover.

Landscaping and Buffering Outstanding Issues

- *Staff requests more detailed information regarding the proposed landscaping plan to assess whether it is sufficient to buffer the proposed parking areas and drive-through facilities from Mooreview Parkway and the adjoining business uses. The use of native plant and tree species is encouraged. Staff also recommends a condition to ensure that the landscaped areas will be maintained for the life of the project.*
 - **Clarification on the buffers has been proposed with this Special Exception. The buffers shown are the required buffers as proposed with the Site Plan Submission for the Retail Center (Type II Side Yard Buffer)**

Circulation, Parking, and Loading Outstanding Issues

- *Staff recommends the applicant provide a schematic depicting pedestrian movement on the subject site to ensure safe and efficient connections between the banks and other buildings in the future retail center. Staff also recommends that green spaces be provided between the sidewalks and the parking lots to clearly separate pedestrian and vehicular traffic.*
 - **As a part of this resubmission the pedestrian walkways and linkages have been clarified between the banks and the retail center. Due to the urban nature of the center, there is not always area available between the parking and pedestrian areas. In this event, the walkway is wider than the required 5'.**
- *Staff recommends that the applicant reevaluate the traffic pattern accessing the proposed drive-through for "Bank 2" and provide additional information regarding traffic circulation on the subject site.*
 - **The 'bypass' lane has been added. There is not a pedestrian crosswalk at the exit area of the drive thru which eliminates pedestrian conflicts.**
- *Staff recommends reducing the amount of impervious surface on the site by providing only those parking spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance for the proposed uses. Staff recommends a low-impact parking lot design that provides filtration of pollutants and retention of parking lot run-off, such as landscaping and the use of natural features.*
 - **The parking calculations are based on a comprehensive total for the shopping center which includes 100 multi-family residential units. The Shopping Center required parking calculation is 4 spaces per 1000 Square Feet of building area. Since these calculations do not break out restaurants separately (per the department of zoning) there is necessity of parking the center from a realistic leasing perspective to draw restaurants for the neighborhood. This accounts for some additional parking spaces.**
 - **The parking lot for the bank area drains to a regional pond which has been designed to filter pollutants and parking lot runoff. This pond has been submitted as a part of a separate application.**

P_HR+Λ

A.77

Virginia Department of Transportation Referral:

From Rashid Siraj, P.E., Transportation Engineer dated October 26, 2006

1. *The right-in access from Mooreview Parkway was intended exclusively for the future day care site. The applicant therefore should somehow ensure that it will not be used by the drive thru bank also.*

Response: The proposed entrance and interparcel access were not intended to be restricted. In fact, as part of the FIDP review, VDOT and County staff had supported the access as a right in via Mooreview Parkway to avoid U-turns on Mooreview Parkway, reduce left turns into the Section IIB shopping Center, and eliminate direct access to Loudoun County Parkway. Restrictions of the driveway to the daycare site only restrict the interparcel connection purpose and the design concepts intended to avoid egress to Mooreview Parkway from the daycare site.

PHR+A

Office of Transportation Services Referral:

From Mark Matthews, Transportation Operation Engineer, dated October 26, 2006

1. *On Page 2 of the Applicant's September 7, 2006 CTD Moorefield Retail Traffic Statement, the Applicant states: "Since a traffic study is not required per the Moorefield Station proffers for the FIDP – 1 development, the traffic analyses did not include a scoping session with Loudoun County." The proffers for ZMAP-2001-0003 clearly state in section IV: 1(ii), "Modified uses or phasing which require a Concept Plan Amendment or Special Exception may require a revised traffic study in accordance with the FSM." Also, a scoping meeting was held and an agreement reached on February 6, 2006. Can the applicant clarify these comments for staff?*

Response:

The applicant had provided a supplement to Mr. George Phillips of Loudoun County OTS to address the concern, as well as provide supplemental materials requests for County review. The following paragraph in the September 22, 2006 outlines the clarification of study scope:

- **Study Requirements** – The submitted report was revised from the November 2004 traffic statement revised through March 2005, for the FIDP for Moorefield Station development west of Route 772 (FIDP 2004-0002). Consistent with the rezoning proffers RZ 2001-0003, traffic studies are required with certain development milestones, so the reference to the need for the traffic study in the report is inaccurate for the new review of proposed special exception of the two bank pad sites in Section II B of the development.
- A pre-scoping meeting between Loudoun County Office of Transportation Services staff and PHR+A to review technical requirements was held on Monday, February 6,

A-78

2006. The pre-scoping meeting minutes are included in Appendix A. The following topics were reviewed with staff prior to analysis preparation:

2. *The Applicant should provide a comparison of the volume and trip generation of proposed uses without the drive-in bank special exception and with the special exception. The Applicant has provided trip generation data for the proposed Special Exception, as seen in Table 3. However, to assess the impact of SPEX-2006-0026, OTS will need a means of comparison. Are the drive-in banks in addition to the approved retail? If not, what is the proposed drive-in banks replacing?*

Response:

The proposed drive-in bank uses are replacing retail uses, as envisioned in the preliminary plans and assumed in the previous traffic studies. The amount of retail displaced varies based on the site design and layout, with a mix of tenants. The drive-in bank uses will encompass between 7,800 and 8,500 gsf of development, subject to final site plan design. In reviewing total trips for Section IIB, the traffic forecasts with the drive-in banks with approximately 150,000 gsf of commercial uses can be compared to the previous traffic analyses used for the FIDP submissions, as shown below

Scenario	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Daily
Nov. 2004 Traffic Statement for 151,000 gsf in Section IIB	320	971	9,868
Sept. 2006 SE revised for 150,000 gsf with 2 drive-in banks	367	1188	10,583

The increases in peak hour trips are accounted for with the planned intersection capacity adjacent to the site, internal mixed use trip reductions west of Route 772, and pass-by trips.

3. *When will the drive-in banks be opened in relation to the phasing of other businesses and improvements?*

Response: The center will be developed generally in one phase. Currently it is proposed as one phase with the submitted site plan. The center cannot open without improvements of Mooreview Parkway and Old Ryan Road.

4. *Depending on phasing and/or peak hour impact, does the applicant propose any additional infrastructure in the vicinity of this site?*

Response: None are anticipated, as the adjacent roadway improvements, signalization, and turn lanes included in the technical analyses are proffered by Moorefield Station, and are under construction as part of adjacent development.



A-79

5. *What bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities are associated with this location?*

Response: There are bicycle lockers included within this center. There are pedestrian walkways, crosswalks and a plaza all proposed as a part of the retail center. Please refer to the attached Retail Center exhibit which will help demonstrate the pedestrian connectivity.

6. *The applicant should fulfill all the proffers required related to this site.*

Response: It is understood by the applicant that the proffers must be satisfied as they relate to this site.

The roadway s are being implemented as part of the site development of Section 2B and the previous infrastructure improvements for Moorefield Greens, to the west. These improvements address the following proffers from ZMAP 2001-0003 IV (Transportation) B. (i) (a through d, for the residential streets west of Ryan Road), IV B. (ii) (a, for Mooreview Parkway adjacent to the site), IV D. (I, interparcel access to Parcel 92/C/4/1 for the daycare site), IV H. (Signalization) (i) (g, Loudoun County Parkway and Mooreview Parkway), (ii) (h, Mooreview Parkway and Ryan Road/Hutchison Street) when warranted, VI. H. (Regional Trail System). The only transportation proffer not implemented for roadway improvements adjacent to the site is IV B. (viii)for Loudoun County Parkway widening southeast of the site, anticipated at 8,000,000 gsf of development at Moorefield Station.



Please let me know if you have any questions or need clarification with any of these responses.
Thank you again for your assistance with this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

Patton Harris Rust & Associates

A Professional Corporation

Mark Thomas, CLA
Director of Planning and Landscape Architecture

A-80